

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/851,121	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WATKINS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher A. Revak	<b>Art Unit</b> 2131	

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher A. Revak.

(2) Barbara Benoit.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 26 May 2005

**Time:** 9am

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*N/A*

**Claims discussed:**

*all*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the applicant's claim language was in the form of intended use and the examiner suggested modifying the language so the allowable feature would be positively recited. In addition, it was determined by the examiner that a 101 issue existed in the claims for reciting non-statutory language. The applicant's representative agreed to an examiner's amendment in order to compact prosecution..